



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,167	12/31/2003	Dong-Shin Jung	Q77527	6951
23373 7590 10/11/2007 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,167

Applicant(s)

JUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen Alvesteffer

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2007 and 05 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20070605 and 20060126.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed July 12, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 15, 20, 25, and 26 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 15, 20, and 25 are independent claims. Claims 1-27 remain pending.

The Information Disclosure Statement filed June 5, 2007 has been considered by the Examiner.

Applicant noted that the Examiner did not initial all of the references cited in the 1449 form submitted February 9, 2005. Examiner notes that the Applicant is likely referring to the 1449 form submitted January 26, 2006. Accordingly, the 1449 form submitted January 26, 2006 has been fully considered by the Examiner and a corrected copy submitted with this Office Action.

Drawings

Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Astiz et al. (hereinafter Astiz), United States Patent number 5,918,012.

Regarding claim 1, Astiz teaches an apparatus for providing object-in-content information, managed by an object-in-content information managing device (see column 6 lines 1-5; *"In the internet embodiment, in particular, the browser 32 receives information from the internet network via the HTTP Server 33 and translates that data from the language used on the internet (called the HTML data format) into a screen display that the user can recognize"*, where the HTTP Server is equivalent to the object-in-content information managing device), comprising a central control unit (see column 5 lines 55-58; *"The embodiment of FIG. 3 has a data processor 30, which can be any standard PC having a microprocessor, memory, a video screen, etc., and including a variety of software components"*, where the data processor is equivalent to the central control unit) operable to receive content, supply basic content information of the content, (see column 6 line 64 through column 7 line 18; *"when the user points the pointing device at a particular portion of the video playing on the viewer screen 41 of the viewer 31 ("selection" in FIG. 3), the viewer 31 sends so-called (x,y,t) data to the*

Art Unit: 2173

browser 32 for processing into a URL code”, where the (x,y,t) data is equivalent to the basic content information) and provide the object-in-content information in a user-viewable format (see column 6 lines 45-49; “Once the viewer 31 has the BTV file and is displaying it to the viewer, the user is then able to point and click onto portions of the full motion video, which causes the viewer 31 to issue a URL address to the browser, which requests the filename specified in the URL from the domain in the URL”); and an object information interface unit operable to transmit a request message including the basic content information to the object-in-content information managing device, receive a response message including the object-in-content information corresponding to the basic content information from the object-in-content information managing device, and transmit the object-in-content information included in the response message to the central control unit (see column 6 lines 46-56; “Once the viewer 31 has the BTV file and is displaying it to the viewer, the user is then able to point and click onto portions of the full motion video, which causes the viewer 31 to issue a URL address to the browser, which requests the filename specified in the URL from the domain in the URL. It also passes on the x, y, and t information (described in more detail below). When the viewer 31 receives the requested data file, the viewer 31 then opens either another browser or another viewer (depending on the MIME type of the hyperlinked data received) to display the data to the user. This display is shown as linked screen 43 in FIG. 4”), wherein the received content is not received through the object-in-content information managing device (see column 6 lines 33-45; “When the video data file is received by the browser 32 from the HTTP Server 33 (FIG. 3 or FIG. 1), the browser 32 recognizes from

the MIME (in this case the .BTV MIME), that it needs to open the BTV viewer 31 and download the BTV data file to the viewer 31 for display to the user on the screen 41", the BTV data file of Astiz is a file containing the mappings between basic content information and the locations of object-in-content information. Astiz's invention is inherently capable of downloading the BTV data file from a different HTTP Server).

Regarding claim 2, Astiz teaches an apparatus for providing object-in-content information of content, comprising a basic content information converting unit operable to receive a message including basic content information of the content and provide converted basic content information corresponding to the basic content information (see column 7 lines 64-67; *"The URL statement identifies the location and name of the CGI script that will coordinate the X-Y coordinates, time coordinates and image map to return an associated URL address"*, where the CGI script is equivalent to the basic content information converting unit, the (x,y,t) data is equivalent to the basic content information, and the URL is equivalent to the converted content information); a storage unit operable to store the object-in-content information (HTTP server); an information search unit operable to extract the object-in-content information stored in the storage unit (web page) by using the converted basic content information (URL); and an object information transmitting unit operable to generate a response message including the object-in-content information provided by the information search unit and transmit the response message to a central control unit, wherein the object information transmitting unit does not transmit the content to the central control unit (see column 8 lines 6-19; *"Once a user makes a selection, the browser 32 then transmits the VHL (from the*

header), X and Y coordinates, and time coordinate to the HTTP Server 33 specified in the CGI URL (from the header). The HTTP Server 33 uses the URL statement to retrieve the script file 34 from a local file server. The video map script 34 then uses the VHL statement to locate and load the appropriate video map 35 identified by the viewer 31 when the user made the selection. The video map script 34 is preferably a C language program that takes the X, Y, and time coordinates from the HTTP Server 33 (originally from the viewer 31), retrieves the appropriate VHL video map 35 and looks up the coordinate data on the map 35 to retrieve a URL address associated with the selection made by the user on the viewer 31").

Regarding claim 3, Astiz teaches that the basic content information converting unit (CGI script) receives the message, transmits the basic content information ((x,y,t) data) to a unit that provides the content (HTTP server), receives the converted basic content information (URL) from the unit and provides the converted basic content information (URL) (see column 7 lines 64-67).

Regarding claims 4-6, Astiz teaches that the basic content information ((x,y,t) data) comprises one of actual coordinates, a click time, a relative time, a content identifier, a channel number, or a combination thereof (column 7 lines 19-23).

Claims 7 and 8 recite a system with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are rejected under the same grounds.

Claims 9 and 10 recite a system with substantially the same limitations as claims 4-6. Therefore, claims 9 and 10 are rejected under the same grounds.

Regarding claim 11, Astiz teaches a content provider operable to provide the content, receive the basic content information through a separate medium other than a medium providing the content, and provide the converted basic content information corresponding to the received basic content information through the separate medium (see Abstract last sentence). In Astiz, the script that converts the basic content information is stored separately from the location of the content itself.

Claim 12 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 13, Astiz teaches providing the object-in-content information included in the response message in a user-viewable format (see column 6 lines 46-56). In Astiz, the object-in-content information is in the form of a user-viewable web page shown in a browser.

Claim 14 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claims 4-6. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 15 recites a system with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 16 and 17 recite a system with substantially the same limitations as claim 11. Therefore, claims 16 and 17 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 18, Astiz teaches an object-in-content information provider operable to provide the object-in-content information without changing the content for the processing unit (see column 8 lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 19, Astiz teaches that the object-in-content information providing unit receives updated object-in-content information for the content. Because the object-in-content information of Astiz is loaded from the Internet, the most up-to-date content always loaded (see column 4 lines 54-59).

Claims 20 and 24 recite an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claims 20 and 24 are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 21 recites an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claim 11. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22 recites an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claim 19. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 23 recites an apparatus comprising substantially the same limitations as claims 4-6. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claims 1-3. Therefore, claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 26 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 11. Therefore, claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 27 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 19. Therefore, claim 27 is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant asserts that Astiz does not teach or suggest that the received content is not received through the object-in-content information managing device 33 as required by claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The BTV data file of Astiz is a file containing the mappings between basic content information and the locations of object-in-content information. Astiz teaches that the BTV MIME file (different from the BTV data file) contains both the video content and an address of where to locate the BTV data file (see column 7 lines 45-58). Astiz's invention is inherently capable of downloading the BTV data file from a different HTTP Server from the HTTP Server where the video content is stored (see column 6 lines 33-45; *"When the video data file is received by the browser 32 from the HTTP Server 33 (FIG. 3 or FIG. 1), the browser 32 recognizes from the MIME (in this case the .BTV MIME), that it needs to open the BTV viewer 31 and download the BTV data file to the viewer 31 for display to the user on the screen 41"*). Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejection of claim 1 because Astiz does not require that the content be stored on the same HTTP server as the object-in-content managing files. On the contrary, it appears that Astiz's invention makes it easy to store object-in-content managing files on a different HTTP server from the video content files.

Applicant asserts that Astiz does not teach or suggest that the object information transmitting unit does not transmit the content to the central control unit as required by claim 2. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As shown above, Astiz's invention does not require that the video content files be stored in the same location as the object-in-content managing files or the object-in-content information itself. Rather, they can all be stored on different HTTP servers or on the client computer (equivalent to the central control unit of the instant application).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571)272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit 2173



10-5-2007

TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

